

<b>Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 09/194,165	<b>Applicant(s)</b> PERKES, LYNN	
	<b>Examiner</b> Patricia Leith	<b>Art Unit</b> 1654	

**All Participants:**
**Status of Application:** \_\_\_\_

 (1) Patricia Leith.

(3) \_\_\_\_

 (2) Elizabeth Kaytor.

(4) \_\_\_\_

**Date of Interview:** 17 March 2004
**Time:** approx. 2PM EST
**Type of Interview:**

- ☒ Telephonic  
☐ Video Conference  
☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

 Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

**Part I.**

Rejection(s) discussed:

*112 First paragraph*

Claims discussed:

*all pending*


Prior art documents discussed:

*none*
**Part II.**

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

*See Continuation Sheet*
**Part III.**

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.  
☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
 (Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Discussed the rejection under 35 USC 112 First paragraph. Agreed that although the claim limitations are broadly drawn to any type of extract, that the skilled artisan could make the claimed invention drawing from the Instant specification as well as what is known in the prior art. Further suggested amending minor informalities in order to place the claims in condition for allowance..